CITY OF MURFREESBORO

HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting July 16, 2019 3:30 PM, Council Chambers, City Hall

- I. Call to Order and determination of a quorum
- II. Approve Minutes of the Regular Meeting on June 18, 2019
- III. New Business
 - H-19-009 401 East Main column replacement
- IV. Staff Reports and Other Business
- V. Adjourn

Regular Meeting Minutes of the Historic Zoning Commission June 18, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jim Thompson, Chairman David Becker, Vice-Chair Bill Jakes Linda Anderson Rick Cantrell Debra Belcher Jennifer Garland ABSENT: Gib Backlund Marimae White

STAFF PRESENT:

Dianna Tomlin, *Principal Planner* Brenda Davis, *Recording Assistant* David Ives, *Assistant Attorney*

Chairman Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Mr. Jakes said the spelling of Ms. Baughman's name was incorrect in the March 19, 2019 minutes and needed to be changed.

Ms. Anderson made a motion to approve the March 19, 2019 minutes with the above change. The motion was seconded by Mr. Becker and carried unanimously in favor.

New Business:

<u>H-19-004</u> – 449 East College Street – The applicant, Mr. Thomas Jennings, requests demolition of the house at this address.

Ms. Tomlin reviewed the application and the Staff comments contained in the HZC agenda package. The applicant was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Thomas Jennings at 121 Gayle Lane came to the podium and said they plan to demolish the home rebuild a traditional Charleston-style home.

Ms. Anderson asked when Mr. Jennings intends to demolish the house.

Mr. Jennings said as soon as possible.

Mr. Becker asked if an agreement has been made with the homeowner at 451 East College Street regarding the shared driveway between the two properties.

Mr. Jennings said he plans to build his house a little narrower than the existing house, so he can have his own driveway.

Chairman Thompson asked if Mr. Jennings was aware of the Guidelines, as the new house needs to be of similar massing and scale with the buildings around it and is aesthetically complementary to the neighborhood.

Mr. Jennings said yes.

Chairman Thompson asked if Mr. Jennings has already drawn-up the plans.

Mr. Jennings said they are currently drawing-up the plans and referred to a picture in the agenda package that shows the exterior they intend to build. He said there is a variety of houses on East College Street.

Chairman Thompson informed Mr. Jennings there are Guidelines. He suggested Mr. Jennings get with Ms. Tomlin before he spends a lot of money drawings and not have them approved. Chairman Thompson also suggested the applicant come back to the Historic Zoning Commission, before he gets too far in the process, to get a general read and consensus if the Commission would approve it or not.

Mr. Jennings thanked Chairman Thompson for his advice.

Mr. Jakes informed Mr. Jennings that he has a task ahead of him since the property is located in the Historic District. Mr. Jakes said the Charleston-style house mentioned as a possibility, while it is historical in style, may not be something that these neighborhoods are familiar with.

Chairman Thompson asked for a vote.

Mr. Becker made a motion to approve the demolition of the house at 449 East College Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cantrell and carried unanimously in favor.

<u>H-19-005</u> – 446 East Main Street – The applicant, Mr. Blake Smith, requested the following 1) construct three types of fence on the property; 2) add lighting to the gate area; 3) repave the driveway; 4) match brick as close as possible to the house.

Ms. Tomlin reviewed the application and the Staff comments contained in the HZC agenda package. The applicant was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Blake Smith at 446 East Main Street came to the podium. He said a neighbor sold him a piece of land behind property and they would like to fence in that area. Mr. Smith showed drawings that showed an existing fence they intend to keep and a wooden fence they will remove. He said they want to remove the wooden fence and build a new fence of similar construction at the back of the lot. Mr. Smith said the framing members on the new wood fence would be placed on the inside of the lot, unlike it is now. He said the new wooden fence would be built on the back of the property. About ten-feet beyond that, there is an existing four-foot high chain link fence on their neighbor's property. He said on the east border, they propose a new 84-inch high fence similar to the one in the back. As a reference, Mr. Smith pointed out the location of his neighbor's gate posts. He intends to move the existing 84-inch high fence and relocate it to the front of the lot, tying it in with one of the columns at the screen porch. Mr. Smith said re-using this fence will leave the visual part of their yard open to the street. He said they plan to install a new gate and repair their driveway. Mr. Smith showed a picture of his neighbor's brick wall as a sample of what they would like to build. He said they will match the brick of their house as close as possible.

Ms. Garland asked what is currently in the location where the new masonry wall is planned to be built.

Mr. Smith said there isn't currently anything there, they are looking to achieve some privacy by building the masonry wall.

Chairman Thompson asked Mr. Smith to review the types of fencing and placements with photographs.

Mr. Smith walked the Commission thru the process, pointing out the location and type of fencing proposed for different sections of the lot. There are three types of fencing proposed: wood, wrought iron, and masonry wall.

Mr. Smith showed the neighbor's masonry wall and said it is similar to what they would like to build. He said the neighbor's wall is 7-feet tall, the columns are slightly taller, with a limestone cap and approximately 12-feet apart. He said the masonry wall will not touch the house, but they will match the brick as close to their house as possible. Mr. Smith said they are also planning to move the driveway over a little to make room for landscaping along the masonry wall.

Chairman Thompson asked if Mr. Smith could show an image of the planned north fence.

Mr. Smith said it looks very similar to the other wrought-iron fence.

Chairman Thompson verified there are three types of fences involved: wood, wrought-iron, and brick.

Mr. Smith said yes.

Mr. Becker asked if the gate would be wrought-iron.

Mr. Smith said yes.

Mr. Becker asked if the driveway will be asphalt or concrete.

Mr. Smith said concrete.

Chairman Thompson asked if the driveway is part of this request today.

Mr. Smith said yes. He said they were thinking of doing decorative concrete from the street to the gate, then standard concrete from there on.

Chairman Thompson said decorative concrete is a concern of his since they don't know what it would look like. Chairman Thompson suggested cut-sheets be provided to show

Mr. Smith asked if the Commission was ok with regular concrete.

Chairman Thompson said yes.

Ms. Anderson reminded everyone the lights will be the same as what is located on their house as indicated when the applicants came before the Commission in the past.

Mr. Smith agreed the lights will be the same, only these will be post-mounted and the lights on the house are wall-mounted.

Chairman Thompson asked how far the lights will extend above the caps.

Mr. Smith said the top of the caps will be close to 8-feet and the fixtures are about 18-inches tall.

Chairman Thompson verified the top of the fence will be at 7-feet and the posts will be 8-feet.

Mr. Smith said yes.

Mr. Jakes mentioned some other ideas of brick colors, maybe matching the neighbor's masonry fence.

Chairman Thompson said there won't be an exact match for whatever color of brick he chooses.

Mr. Smith said his masonry fence will not touch any other brick but he wants it to look good.

Ms. Garland asked if Mr. Blake needs to come back to the Commission after a brick sample is selected.

Chairman Thompson said the Commission likes to see samples of proposed materials and ask Mr. Smith to provide a brick sample when chosen.

Mr. Smith said he will provide the brick sample once he gets to that point in the process. He offered to bring cut-sheets for the lights.

Chairman Thompson asked the applicant to provide a package that has everything so when the work is inspected they will know what was approved was installed. He said the Commission can give conditional approval with the exceptions, followed-up with the cut-sheet to be provided.

Mr. Smith asked who should get the cut-sheets.

Chairman Thompson said to give them to Ms. Tomlin.

Ms. Tomlin stated Mr. Smith can bring the cut-sheets to the same location he brought this application. She also said the application needs to be revised if he wants to add lights because it is not in the application.

Chairman Thompson said the application needs to be amended to include the driveway as well.

Mr. Jakes asked for a sample of concrete along with the other samples.

Mr. Smith asked what the Commission would like to see regarding the concrete.

Mr. Jakes said the Commission is open, they just want it to be right.

Chairman Thompson asked if Mr. Smith was thinking of a stamped pattern.

Mr. Smith was thinking of a stamped-brick or stamped-cobblestone look. He said anything would be an improvement to the broken asphalt that is currently there.

Chairman Thompson asked Mr. Smith to submit a drawing that shows the extent to which he wants to do this stamped concrete and a cut-sheet that shows the pattern.

Mr. Smith appreciated the suggestions.

Chairman Thompson said other items can be approved today but some of the small details need to be provided just so the Commission agrees it will fit within the neighborhood.

Mr. Smith asked if the Commission would be ok with plain concrete.

Chairman Thompson suspects he would get approval on plain concrete, but not sure of the stamped concrete.

Mr. Jakes made a motion to approve the following: 1) construct three types of fence on the property; 2) add lighting to the gate area; 3) repave the driveway; 4) match brick as close as possible to the house. A cut-sheet is required that shows the three types of fence, a picture of the lights, type of pavement for the driveway (concrete / stamped concrete) and brick choice. The cut-sheet should be delivered to Dianna Tomlin, Principal Planner. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cantrell and carried unanimously in favor.

Ms. Tomlin asked if the Commission wants Mr. Smith to bring the cut-sheet back for final approval.

Chairman Thompson asked Mr. Smith if providing the cut-sheet would delay his construction.

Mr. Smith said they will probably start the wood fence immediately.

Chairman Thompson said the wood fence is not the issue, but the brick choice.

Mr. Smith said whatever the Commission recommends as he is not going to have the fence installed before next month's Historic Zoning Commission meeting.

Chairman Thompson said if this did cause a delay, the applicant could send pictures to Ms. Tomlin and she could forward them to the Commission Members. If he would like to bring it to the next meeting, they will vote on it.

Mr. Smith asked if the Commission would be ok with him cutting a footing for the driveway before the next meeting.

Chairman Thompson said yes, the Commission does not want to delay his construction.

Mr. Smith thanked the Commission. He plans to choose three brick samples for the Commission to review.

Ms. Garland asked Mr. Smith to take pictures of the chosen bricks against the house that will show the contrast.

Mr. Smith agreed and will do the pictures. He thanked the Commission again for their suggestions and help.

 $\underline{\text{H-}19\text{-}006}$ – 415 East College Street – The applicant, Ms. Mary Baughman, requested to add railing to the front porch.

Ms. Tomlin reviewed the application and the Staff comments contained in the HZC agenda package. The applicant was not present.

Ms. Anderson asked the composition of the spindles.

Ms. Tomlin said will replace with wood as that is what is currently in the railings.

Chairman Thompson asked if the spindle was a square or turn spindle.

Ms. Tomlin assumed, from their conversation, she is speaking of a square spindle as that is what is in the window.

Chairman Thompson said the image presented to the Commission is a turned spindle.

Ms. Tomlin said Ms. Baughman asked her to present the application and show the picture from Google, so the Commission Members could see her house.

Mr. Becker asked the height of the posts.

Ms. Tomlin said the requested height is not on the application, so the Commission can set that.

Chairman Thompson asked if a railing for the steps would be included.

Ms. Tomlin said there is no railing request for the steps. Ms. Baughman is just requesting railing be put between the two columns located on the porch only.

Chairman Thompson asked the height of the porch.

Mr. Becker said he drove by the property and said the porch was approximately 2.5 feet high.

Chairman Thompson said there is not enough information for the Commission to review this application. He said they need an architectural drawing that would show two pairs of columns with the detail.

Mr. Cantrell made a motion to defer the request to add railing to the front porch at 415 East College Street as more detailed information is needed. The motion was seconded by Mr Becker and carried unanimously in favor.

HZC	Mi	nutes
June	18,	2019

Staff Reports and Other Business

Ms. Tomlin spoke with Mr. Donald Anthony, Planning Director concerning the survey they wanted to do and applying for the Grant thru the State Historic Board. Mr. Anthony is fine to move forward and will be glad to help. She has received the application and will start working on completing it.

Ms. Anderson made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Becker and carried unanimously in favor.

The	meeting	adjourned	at	4:10	PI	1
1110	mooning	adjourned	uı	1.10	T .T.	1.

CHAIRMAN	SECRETARY	

Murfreesboro Historic Zoning Commission Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Received Planning Department

JUN 27 2019

111 West Vine Street Murfreesboro, TN 37130

Planning Department P.O. Box 1139 Telephone: (615) 893-6441 Fax: (615) 849-2606 111 West Vine Street Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37130 Date 6-27-/9	
Property Address 401 EAST MAIN	_
Applicant Mark Green Contact Phone(s) 615 - 829-0079	_
E-Mail Address Final Phase Construct @gmail. Con	
Mailing Address 2452 Laneds Ct.	
City Cristiana State TN Zip Code 37037	_
Property Owner (If different than above) Linda Parks Contact Phone 615-653-53	298
Mailing Address 401 EAST MAIN	_
City Mufnee Shora State TN Zip Code 37128	
"Only exterior projects visible from a public right-of-way (R-O-W) are reviewed"	
TYPE OF WORK: New Const Demolition Alterations Other	
Exterior Repairs/Maintenance, <u>no</u> appearance changes (Administrative)	
NEW CONSTRUCTION (Additions are considered new construction)	
 Site plans must show entire lot with setbacks noted and site improvements (e.g. sidewalks, lighting) Elevation drawings must show each façade with dimensions and material specifications Front elevations must include adjacent principal structures (to compare size and scale) Applications should include photographs, samples, product literature, manufacturer's illustrations, etc. 	

DEMOLITION

- 1. Application must include written description of structure's condition and reason for demolition.
- 2. Photographs must include structure's current condition showing all elevations and the interior of structure.
- 3. Provide a description of the proposed reuse of the site to include plans of the new structure.

awning or canopy	light fixtures	porch flooring	snutters
cleaning	landscaping	railings	siding
curb cut	masonry work	retaining wall	signs
deck	mechanical system	_roofing	skylights
door	ornamentation	_satellite dish	steps
fence	painting	security doors	storm doors
general repair	paving	security windows	storm windows
gutters	porch columns	sidewalks	windows
Description of all work to	be performed (You may use a	1	/
due to wea	Roplace dama the corrosion re wood nate,	læ water dan	age.
the de	mentiso	at a cs more	rola Up 10
Commission prior to beginn	on of work shown on the application of work. When necessary, a plans are needed for review. The	accurate scale elevations, drawin	ngs, photographs, brochures,
Council must be approved	nother body such as the Board prior to submittal to the Core representative must have the y the Commission.	mmission. Someone must b	e present at the meeting to
NOTE: There will be a Department at 893-6441 to	t least one inspection prior to schedule the inspection.	o completion of the project.	Please call the Planning
	n application to the Planning of the Murfreesboro Historic		
•	pplications must include doc the proposed exterior ap	pearance of the project"	
Estimated cost of work <u>*</u>	15,860,00 - 8	33,650.00 Perd	ling material Selecte
Signature (owner)	$-\rho$		
Signature (applicant)	fal)	E	

ALL DRAWINGS, ELEVATIONS & SITE PLANS MUST BE DRAWN TO SCALE

<u>ALTERATIONS</u> (Check each item of work to be done. If not listed please fully explain in space provided below)

REMAINDER OF APPLICATION TO BE COMPLETED BY STAFF

Application Received by		Date	
Application approved	Date		÷
Application denied for the meeting and in a letter from the C	following reasons.	The reason for denial will be shown in the Minutes of	the
	-1044 to 2000		
Application administratively appr	oved by:	Date	
INSPECTIONS: Approvals from	n the Commission r	equire at least one (1) inspection.	
1.) Approved	Failed	Date	
2.) Approved	Failed	Date	

City of Murfreesboro Historic Zoning Commission Staff Comments

III. New Business:

H-19-009 -401 East Main

This property is located on the north side of East College Street and encompasses approximately 0.25 acres. The lot is within the Historic Overlay Zone and is zoned Residential-10 on the City of Murfreesboro Zoning map. This home is a contributing structure in the East Main Street Historic District of the National Register of Historic Places and the E Main Street Local Designation. The home was constructed around 1870 in the Colonial Revival style. It is a brick, two story home with a hip roof, porch, pediment fan and bay.

The property owner wishes to replace the existing columns due to damage. Replacement columns will be of a more durable material, but the applicant states columns will look identical to those being replaced. The replacement will be considered an alteration to the property.

The Historic District Guidelines state that an alteration is a change in building material; the addition of any architectural feature of a structure; a repair that reconstructs any part of an existing building; an addition that extends or increases floor area or height of any building; addition of accessory structures.

The General Principles adopted for alteration are as follows:

- These guidelines shall apply only to the exteriors of buildings and to areas of lots visible from public rights of way.
- Proposals for exterior work to be done on facades visible from the front and street related elevations shall be more carefully reviewed than are other facades.
- The distinguishing original qualities or character or a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historical material, distinctive architectural features, should be avoided.
- All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.
- Changes, which may have taken place in the course of time, are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance of their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.
- Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship, which characterize a building, structure, or site shall be treated with sensitivity.
- Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features

- should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical, physical or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural design or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.
- The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that damage historic building materials shall not be undertaken. Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by, or adjacent to a project.
- Contemporary design for alterations to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations do no destroy the significant historical, architectural or cultural material; and when such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.
- Whenever possible, alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if such alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.

The guidelines adopted for alterations (additions) are as follows:

- Additions are areas that increase the living or working space of a structure. This does not include the addition of architectural detail elements.
- Porches:
 - Original details and shape, outline, roof height, and roof pitch should be retained.
 - Original porch materials and architectural details should be maintained. If different materials are substituted, they should be a close visual approximation of the original.
 - The enclosing of front and side porches visible from the public right of way is inappropriate.
 - The enclosing of side porches may be considered appropriate if the openness and character of the original porch is maintained.

• Architectural Details:

- Original Details should not be removed.
- The replacement of irreparable details should be with close visual approximations of the originals based on historical or physical data where available.
- The replacement of missing original details should be based on accurate duplication, or should be close visual approximations of the originals, based on historic, physical, or pictorial documentation.
- Architectural details of any period or style not original to the building should not be introduced.
- Changes that have taken place in the course of time, which is evidence of the history and development of a building, and its environment may have acquired significance in their own right; their significance should be recognized and respected.

















